Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-22 were rejected. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-11, 14-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kagan et al. (US 6,243,787). Claims 5, 7, 9, 12-13, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagan et al. in view of Dobson et al. (US 6,766,386).

Claims 1, 4, 7- 8, 12, 14, 18, and 22 are amended. Claims 3, 6, 11, 16, and 21 are canceled. The features recited in claims 3, 6, 11, 16, and 21 are incorporated in their respective independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 18. No new subject matter is added. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, and 22 remain in the case for consideration. Reconsideration and allowance of all the remaining claims are requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102& 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-11, 14-18, and 20-21 as being anticipated by Kagan. The applicant traverses the rejections for the reasons that follow.

Claim1 recites "A network device, comprising...a second port to allow the device to communicate with devices on a system bus." Claim 14 recite similar features. *See* Specification, page 4, lines 18-19.

The Examiner alleges that Kagan teaches a network device (alleged to be Kagan's HCA 32) having a second port to communicate with devices (alleged to be Kagan's 24 in FIG. 1) on a second bus. But Kagan's HCA 32 does not communicate with device 24 on a system bus as specifically claimed in claims 1 and 14. As shown in Kagan's FIG. 1, Kagan's HCA 32 communicates with device 24 via bus 50, which is "a standard I/O bus 50, such as a PCI bus, for the purpose of communicating with peripheral devices, such as I/O adapters of various types." *See* Kagan, Col. 5, lines 15-18. That is, Kagan's bus 50 is an expansion bus for allowing

communications between system processors and peripheral devices, not a system bus. Put yet another way, Kagan's HCA 32 communicates with device 24 via an expansion bus, rather than a system bus as claimed.

Claim 1 further recites "A network device, comprising...a processor to...receive an interrupt signal intended for a system processor from the expansion device on the expansion bus in a command path and to prevent the interrupt signal from reaching the system processor in the command path." Claims 8, 14, and 18 recite similar features.

The Examiner alleges that Kagan teaches this particular feature of a network device (alleged to be Kagan's HCA 32). But Kagan's interrupt packet is "a management packet addressed to the LID of HCA 32. It is preferably sent by controller 46 over the same channel, or virtual lane, as the data packets..." *See* Kagan, Col. 6, lines 48-60. That is, Kagan teaches sending an interrupt packet to HCA 32 in a data path, not a command path. As such, Kagan receives the interrupt packet in a data path, not a command path.

Although Kagan's interrupt packet might be sent on a different route from the data path (*See* Kagan, Col. 7, lines 5-10), Kagan does not necessarily "prevent the interrupt signal from reaching the system processor in the command path" as claimed. Since the controller 46 of target interface unit 40 is programmed to send the interrupt packet to HCA 32only after receiving the acknowledgment from memory 22 that all data has been received, and thus obviates the need to "prevent the interrupt signal from reaching the system processor in the command path". *See* Kagan, Col. 6, lines 61-63, and Col. 7, lines 28-32. In other words, if Kagan does receive an interrupt signal intended for a system processor from the expansion device on the expansion bus in a command path, Kagan cannot also teach preventing the interrupt signal from reaching the system processor in the command path as recited in the claims.

Claim 1 also recites "A network device, comprising…a processor to generate a read request to the expansion device". Claims 8, 14, and 18 recite similar features. *See* Specification, page 6, lines 21-23.

Kagan does not teach a network processor (alleged to be Kagan's HCA 32) that generates a read request to the expansion device. Kagan teaches "the CPU can send its dummy read command…." *See* Kagan, Col. 6, lines 55-56. That is, Kagan teaches the CPU generating a read request, not the HCA 32.

Therefore, Kagan does not teach the features recited in claims 1, 8, 14, and 16, much less in their respective dependent claims. Dobson does not cure the deficiencies in Kagan. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, and 22 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

_____

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613